

FRS / States Data Exchange Lessons Learned

State Facility/Sites and Environmental Interest Integrated into FRS

<u>State</u>	<u>Site</u>	<u>Interest</u>
MD	5,811	14,314
MN	36,328	39,278
MS	7,283	8,416
NE	21,761	35,851
OH	45,201	58,896
PA	37,186	39,968
SC	13,174	16,274
UT	9,073	10,269

State Facility Site discrepancies are records that are flagged and identified as multiple State records where EPA's FRS has these records linked to a single places in the EPA database. (multiple State Facility Site records linked to one FRS record)

24 FRS records with more than one MS-ENSITE record linked to it
486 FRS records with more than one PA record linked to it
324 FRS records with more than one SC record linked to it
45 FRS records with more than one UT record linked to it

The Challenge seems to be: *How to create a unique record which is responsive to business needs.*

This indicates a need for a common method for defining complex facilities. However, this common definition might not be flexible enough to allow exceptions and changes to occur which are necessary because of special needs or considerations. Exception to the rule undermines a "Standard Setting Process"!

- State Environmental Interest Mappings
 - Broad environmental categories need to be created, then defined, add, or delete, as necessary.
 - States could map (or review mapping of) its interests to the broader categories.
 - States should provide definitions of their environmental interest types
 - UT "Multi-permitted Site" creates a particular challenge. Sites with multiple permits need to have multiple interest records defined, one for each type of permit.
 - "Laboratory" does not fit into a broad category.

The Challenge seems to be: How to get program mapping specific enough to accommodate all programs without creating a listing which is too long.

- State Data Gaps in their “master” record
 - Latitude/Longitude data - not provided.
 - Organization data - not provided.
 - Contact data - not provided.
 - Mailing Address data - not provided.
 - SIC/NAICS data - not provided.
 - Locational physical address data element
 - Missing
 - P.O. Box
 - Invalid (“NO ADDRESS GIVEN”, “UNKOWN”)
 - Insufficient information to locate a facility (e.g., “Main Street”, “Route 522”).
 - Location data elements inconsistent (city, county, ZIP Code, State combination)
 - FRS uses USPS and FIPS 55.
 - Are States verifying or validating location address? Which resources are being used for validation?

The Challenge seems to be: Not to make the documentation of data, the general reconciliation, and the agreement memorandum so burdensome individually or collectively that the target of high quality data is lost in the particulars. Working on the data is the most important exercise that we want our resources to be focused on. Sharing the data seems to be the best way to improve data, all things considered.

- Transfer Methods used to transfer data. All have been easily received by the EPA-FRS team. None seem better or worst to process once the file format is confirmed by both trading partners.
 - XML files.(PA, MN)
 - Fixed block, ASCII Flat Files via ftp to FRS servers (MS, SC)
 - Fixed block, ASCII Flat Files downloaded from State server (UT)

The lesson here seems to be that it really does not matter what the transfer file format is as long as the participating parties have documented what is being mapped to the data elements and agreement has been reached on categorization of the programs. The data is the important product and the format should be not be burdensome.